

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ **BLACK BORDERS**
- ☐ **IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- ☐ **FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- ☐ **COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- ☐ **GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- ☐ **LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- ☐ **REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- ☐ **OTHER:** _____

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/837,632	04/19/2001	Jesse Perla	1351829.0016	8089

7590 08/13/2004

FASKEN MARTINEAU DuMOULIN LLP
Toronto Dominion Bank Tower, Ste 4200
P.O. Box 20
Toronto-Dominion Centre
Toronto, ON M5K 1N6
CANADA

EXAMINER

PHAN, TAM T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2144

DATE MAILED: 08/13/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/837,632

Applicant(s)

PERLA ET AL.

Examiner

Tam (Jenny) Phan

Art Unit

2144

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 February 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 19 April 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) *
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 02/27/2002.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This application has been examined. Claim 1 is presented for examination.

Priority

2. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.
3. This application is a continuation of PCT/CA01/00149 01/31/2001 and is a CIP of 09/471,135 12/23/1999.
4. This application claims priority of Foreign Applications: Canada 2,297,596 (01/31/2000); Canada 2,297,597 (01/31/2000); Canada 2,297,711 (01/31/2000).
5. Any new subject matter defined in the claims not previously disclosed in claimed parent applications above, is entitled to the effective filing date of 04/19/2001.

Information Disclosure Statement

6. An initialed and dated copy of Applicant's IDS form 1449, Received 02/27/2002, is attached to the instant Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2144

8. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Praitis et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,594,697), hereinafter referred to as Praitis, in view of Bridgman et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,523,062), hereinafter referred to as Bridgman.

9. Praitis disclosed a method for generating error messages in a web based application, said method comprising the steps of: searching said application for a predetermined error number, retrieving an error message corresponding to said error number; and displaying said error form on a requesting device (Figures 2-3, 5, 8-11, column 7 line 44-column9 line 3, column 9 lines 39-51, column 11 lines 16-27)

10. Praitis taught the invention substantially as claimed. However, Praitis did not expressly teach applying said error message to a style sheet in an error form.

11. Praitis suggested exploration of art and/or provided a reason to modify the method with the style sheet feature (column 1 lines 27-37, column 6 lines 35-47).

12. Bridgman disclosed a method of applying the error message to a style sheet in an output document [error form] (Figure 2, column 2 lines 29-65).

13. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the method of Praitis with the teachings of Bridgman to include the step of applying the error message [output message] to a style sheet in an output document [error form] in order to provide an efficient means of filtering output documents since style sheet described transformation from one document type to another, such as transforming XML document to

Art Unit: 2144

WML document, which would allow constraint device such as thin clients to display the output form [error form] (Bridgman, column 2 lines 29-65).

14. Since all the limitations of the claimed invention were disclosed by the combination of Praitis and Bridgman, claim 1 is rejected.

15. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miksovsky et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,526,529), hereinafter referred to as Miksovsky, in view of Hind et al. (U.S Patent Number 6,585,778), hereinafter referred to as Hind.

16. Miksovsky disclosed a method for generating error messages in a web based application, said method comprising the steps of: searching said application for a predetermined error number, retrieving an error message corresponding to said error number; and displaying said error form on a requesting device (Abstract, Figures 5A-6, column 5 lines 56-67, column 6 lines 1-29, column 6 line 64-column 7 line 12).

17. Miksovsky taught the invention substantially as claimed. However, Miksovsky did not expressly teach applying said error message to a style sheet in an error form

18. Miksovsky suggested exploration of art and/or provided a reason to modify the method with the style sheet feature to display output documents for used with hand-held devices (column 2 line 63-column 3 line 6).

Art Unit: 2144

19. Hind disclosed a method of applying the error message to a style sheet in an output document [error form] (Abstract, Figures 2-4, 7, column 7 lines 19-50, column 7 line 65-column 8 line 57).

20. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the method of Miksovsky with the teachings of Hind to include the step of applying the error message [output message] to a style sheet in an output document [error form] in order to transform the output error form into format that would be better suited to the target clients (Hind, column 7 lines 19-33) since wireless devices, such as cell phone and PDA, would need a document presentation that their limited function could handle (Hind, column 7 lines 34-50).

21. Since all the limitations of the claimed invention were disclosed by the combination of Miksovsky and Hind, claim 1 is rejected.

Conclusion

22. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

a. Kelley (U.S. Patent Number 6,526,524) disclosed a method and apparatus for providing feedback to a programmer of a web-based application notifying the programmer of application errors encountered by an end user of the application. An error table is created to log application errors when a user computer is running the web-based application. The error table containing entries comprising an application name, an error number, and the error message.

Art Unit: 2144

b. Hind et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,715,129) disclosed a method, system, and computer program product for using Java Server Pages to enable transcoding the content of a document requested by a client, in order to tailor the output document according to application-specific characteristics. In particular, the present invention enables the JSP author to override input source request characteristics and to specify transcoding hints to be used by a transcoding filter for selecting an appropriate style sheet. An example of the advantage of using application-specific characteristics to transcode a document can be seen in the scenario where a transcoding filter is processing an HTML document, converting the input page into an XML document using a generic HTML-to-XML transcoding process where the XML document is then processed by applying XSL style sheets in an XSL engine. In this scenario, a single DTD is the only application characteristic available to the transcoding process; hence, all HTML web applications using this scenario would receive the same generic transformations

23. Refer to the enclosed PTO-892 for details and complete listing of other pertinent prior art of record.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tam (Jenny) Phan whose telephone number is (703) 305-4665. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Cuchlinski can be reached on 703-308-3873. The

Art Unit: 2144

fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



William Cuchlinski
SPE
Art Unit 2144
703-308-3873

tp
August 5, 2004